

Applic. No. 10/766,593

Amdt. dated August 30, 2005

Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-21 remain in the application. Claims 2 and 6 are being cancelled herewith. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 have been amended. Claims 5 and 7-21 have been withdrawn from consideration.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1 and 2 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Shannon (U.S. Patent No. 6,153,316) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 15, lines 1-3, page 16, lines 1-4, and in claim 2 of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/766,593

Amdt. dated August 30, 2005

Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

an aluminum plate having a thickness, a hard-anodized top layer, and a scoring groove formed therein, the scoring groove having a residual thickness of at least 0.1 mm.

The Shannon reference discloses a cold reduced aluminum sheet that is reduced by 5%.

The reference does not show an aluminum plate having a thickness, a hard-anodized top layer, and a scoring groove formed therein, the scoring groove having a residual thickness of at least 0.1 mm as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. The Shannon reference does not disclose a scoring groove formed in the sheet with a residual of 0.1 mm. This is contrary to the invention of the instant application as claimed, in which an aluminum plate has a thickness, a hard-anodized top layer, and a scoring groove formed therein, the scoring groove has a residual thickness of at least 0.1 mm.

In item 5 on page 3 of the Office action, claims 3 and 4 have been rejected as being obvious over Shannon (U.S. Patent No. 6,153,316) in view of Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,540,449) (hereinafter "Yoshida") under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Yoshida does not make up for the deficiencies of Shannon.

Applic. No. 10/766,593

Amdt. dated August 30, 2005

Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

Therefore, since claim 1 is believed to be allowable,
dependent claims 3 and 4 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the
references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either
show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is,
therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since
all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim
1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of
claims 1, 3-5, and 7-21 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims
to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone
call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked
out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition
for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/766,593
Amdt. dated August 30, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 13, 2005

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner &
Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

August 30, 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101